



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,113	07/11/2001	Katsuhiko Mochizuki	1232-01	7939
35811	7590	01/11/2008	EXAMINER	
IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER US LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE 1650 MARKET ST, SUITE 4900 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			BUTLER, PATRICK	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1791		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/889,113	MOCHIZUKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick Butler	1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 15-19,21,22 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 15-19,21,22 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 15-19, 21, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 15 claims product with strength from a stress-strain curve in line 2 of the claim. However, said claimed strength derivation from a stress-strain curve is not disclosed by the specification. Only general strength is disclosed (see Specification, page 5, lines 24-25). Claims 16-19, 21, 22, and 24 are rejected via their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 15-19, 21, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimoto (EP 1033422A1) in view of Rowan et al. (US Patent No. 4,851,172) and Toshio et al. (Japanese Patent Publication No. JP 52066769 A).

With respect to Claim 15, Fujimoto teaches a method of producing a poly(trimethylene terephthalate) fiber where the yarn is drawn, heat treated and then subjected to a relaxation treatment (a polymer substantially comprising polytrimethylene terephthalate) [0035]. The intrinsic viscosity of the polymer is 0.4 – 1.5, preferably 0.7 – 1.2 (intrinsic viscosity at least 0.7) [0016]. In the process, the multifilaments are extruded from a spinning machine (method of producing multifilament yarn; melt spun) [0035] and wound round a first roll heated at 30 – 80 °C and then a second heated roll at 100 to 160 °C (hauled-off via a first heated roll; second heated roll; continuously subjected to a heat-treatment at the second roll and a relaxation heat treatment; the second heated roll at 105-180 °C) [0038]. The multifilaments are wound around a first roll at a speed of 300-3,500 m/min (at a spinning rate of at least 2,000 m/min.) ([0036] and [0037]), drawn by a second roll at a ratio of 1.3 to 4 (without winding, subjected to drawing performed between the first heated roll and a second roll at low draw rate) [0038], wound round the second roll (by plural laps of the yarn) [0036], relaxed at a ratio of 0.8-0.999, with the ratio being the winding speed/peripheral speed of the second roll (at a relaxation factor of 10-20% between the second heated roll and a winder) [0040], mixed by methods such as interlacing before incorporating the yarn into fabric (after which it is continuously subjected to an interlacing treatment) [0045], and wound up on a winder (and wound up as a package) [0036].

"[B]y employing the heat of a second heated roller... a relaxation heat treatment is carried out" (see Applicant's Specification, page 13, lines 12-30). Thus, Applicant's Specification clarifies that a heat treatment at a second roll is inherently sufficient to

provide a relaxation heat treatment between the second heated roll and a third roll or between the second heated roll and a winder. Such inherency is supported by the heat of the roller transferring to the wrapped yarn which then leaves the roller and continuing its heat treatment until it cools.

Fujimoto fails to teach that the second heated roll used for the relaxation treatment has a surface roughness of 1.5 S – 8 S as required by claim 15.

Rowan is directed to a process for high speed, multi-end polyester yarn (Title). Rowan teaches manufacturing a multi-filament yarn by extruding, passing the filaments through drawing rolls, then through relaxing rolls, and then finally through a conventional air interlacing jet and then wound up (columns 2 and 3). The surface finish (R_a) value for the rolls other than the first encountered roll can be between 35 and 120 microinches (0.89 – 3.0 micrometers) (column 4, lines 10 – 20). On page 14 of Applicant's Specification, Applicant indicates that 1.5S – 8S is equivalent to 0.8 – 6.3 micrometers as required by claims 15. Rowan suggests that the use of matte rollers produce a yarn with excellent mechanical qualities (column 4, lines 25 – 40).

Rowan does not appear to explicitly teach that R_{max} of the R_a is within the claimed range (e.g., 1.5S – 8S).

However, in this regard, Rowan teaches this value for R_a as previously described as well as making the surface smooth, which would minimize the variation in the surface (see col. 5, line 4). As such, Rowan recognizes that the respective R_{max} is a result-effective variable. Since R_{max} is a result-effective variable, one of ordinary skill in the art would have obviously been motivated to determine the optimum R_{max} applied in the

process of Rowan through routine experimentation based upon minimizing the variation in R_a to achieve a smooth surface (see col. 5, line 4).

Since Fujimoto lacks disclosure to specific details about the surface roughness of the second heated roller, it would have been necessary and thus obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art practicing the invention of Fujimoto to look to the prior art as exemplified by Rowan to provide the details of the relaxation roller's surface texture. As heated matte rollers having a temperature of at least 140 °C and a surface finish value of 0.89 – 3.0 micrometers which has a relaxation between 1 – 10 percent produces a yarn with excellent mechanical qualities (see Rowan, col. 4, lines 33-35), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the heated matte finish relaxation rollers of Rowan in the invention of Fujimoto, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Fujimoto.

Fujimoto fails to expressly teach intermingling to a specific CF value.

Toshio teaches interlacing to a CF value of 10-100 with a synthetic multifilament fiber (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Toshio's CF value with Fujimoto's process of making filaments and intermingling in order to manufacture a sizeless, twistless fabric (see Toshio) and to give a fabric thus obtained excellent softness, stretchability properties, and color developing properties (see Fujimoto [0044]).

Fujimoto discloses the claimed invention of interlacing before incorporating the formed yarn into fabric [0045] except for expressly teaching that the interlacing is before

winding. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to interlace is before winding, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167.

Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio teach that the breaking extension of the yarn is 40% or more, the strength from a stress-strain curve of at least 3 cN/dtex, a Young's modulus of no more than 25 cN/dtex, a minimum value of a differential Young's modulus at 3-10% elongation of no more than 6.6 CN/dtex, and an elastic recovery following 10% elongation of at least 90% principally because they teach the same claimed process.

With respect to Claim 16, Fujimoto teaches that the intrinsic viscosity of the polymer is 0.4 – 1.5, preferably 0.7 – 1.2 (intrinsic viscosity at least 0.8) [0016].

As to claim 17, Fujimoto teaches that multifilaments are extruded from a spinning machine at a temperature from 250 – 290 °C [0033], which is 22 – 62°C higher than the melt temperature.

As to claims 18, Fujimoto teaches that the fibers are drawn on the first roll heated at 30 – 80 °C having a peripheral speed of 300 to 3,500 m/min without winding thereon (>3,000 m/min.) [0035].

As to claim 19, Fujimoto teaches in Example 13 that the relaxation ratio is 0.88 (see Table 1 continued, Example 13), which is equivalent to a relaxation factor of 12%.

With respect to Claim 21, Rowan teaches that the surface finish value for the rolls can be between 35 and 120 microinches (0.89 – 3.0 micrometers) (column 4, lines

10 – 20). On page 14 of Applicant's Specification, Applicant indicates that 1.5S – 8S is equivalent to 0.8 – 6.3 micrometers as required by claims 21 (3.2 S – 6.3 S).

With respect to Claim 22, the draw temperature is -15 – 35 °C higher (10-50 °C higher) than the glass transition temperature of poly (trimethylene terephthalate), which is 45 °C.

As to claim 23, Fujimoto teaches that the fibers have the relaxation heat treatment performed on the second and third rolls at temperatures 100 – 160 °C and 120 – 150 °C respectively (page 8, lines 25 – 55).

As to claim 24, Fujimoto teaches that the draw ratio can be 2.20 in Example 13. The Examiner considers a draw ratio of 2.20 to be a "low" draw rate as required by Applicant. Fujimoto in view of Rowan and Toshio teach having strength from a stress/strain curve of at least 3cN/dtex and a breaking extension of at least 42% principally because they teach the same claimed process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 31 October 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues with respect to the 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, rejections. Applicant's arguments appear to be on the grounds that:

1) Table 1 of page 25 of Applicant's Specification shows examples below and equal to 6.6 cN/dtex and page 6, line 6 teaches "a minimum value of... no more than 10 cN/dtex." Thus, the claimed minimum value of no more than 6.6 cN/dtex is supported by the Specification.

2) The claimed elastic recovery is supported by page 7, lines 1 and 2 of Application's Specification.

Applicant argues with respect to the 35 USC 103(a) rejections. Applicant's arguments appear to be on the grounds that:

3) Fujimoto provides the claimed heat treatment at a second roll. However, the additional claimed requirement of a relaxation heat treatment is not met by Fujimoto. The claimed relaxation heat treatment is a relaxation heat treatment between the second heated roll and a third roll or between the second heated roll and a winder.

The Applicant's arguments are addressed as follows:

1 and 2) Applicant's arguments with respect to claimed minimum value of no more than 6.6 cN/dtex and elastic recovery have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Examiner withdraws the respective portions of the previously set forth 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection as detailed in the Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 section of the Office Action dated 21 September 2007. Thus, the remaining 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection, as conceded without discussion is Applicant's Arguments, is maintained above.

3) As clarified above:

"[B]y employing the heat of a second heated roller... a relaxation heat treatment is carried out" (see Applicant's Specification, page 13, lines 12-30). Thus, Applicant's Specification clarifies that a heat treatment at a second roll is inherently sufficient to provide a relaxation heat treatment between the second heated roll and a third roll or between the second heated roll and a winder. Such

inherency is supported by the heat of the roller transferring to the wrapped yarn which then leaves the roller and continuing its heat treatment until it cools.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Butler whose telephone number is (571) 272-8517. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thu. 7:30 a.m.-5 p.m. and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Patrick Butler
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 1791



CHRISTINA JOHNSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER